



Memorandum

TO: COYOTE VALLEY SPECIFIC
PLAN TASK FORCE

FROM: Sal Yakubu

**SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON 3/15/05**

DATE: April 7, 2005

Approved

Date

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

David Bischoff (Consultant for City of Morgan Hill), Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), Tedd Faraone (Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning), Bobbie Fischler (League of Women Voters), Mark Frederick (County Parks), Mike Griffis (County Roads), Tracy Hemmeter (SCVWD), Mary Hughes (Habitat for Humanity), Trixie Johnson (FROG), Libby Lucas (California Native Plant Society), Dennis Martin (Home Builders Association), Annie Mudge (Coyote Housing Group), Elizabeth Petrinovich (Office of Senator Abel Maldonado), Elish Ryan (County Parks), Bill Smith (SCVWD), John Roeder (Great Oaks Water Company), Tim Steele (Sobrato), Vince Stephens (SCVWD), Brenda Torres-Barreto (Audubon Society) and Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group).

City and Other Public Agency Staff Present:

Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Mike Mena (PBCE) and Sylvia Do (PBCE).

Consultants:

Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jim Thompson (HMH Engineers), Mike Campbell (HMH Engineers), Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers) and Eileen Goodwin (Apex Strategies).

Members of the Public:

Andrea Ballesterio (UC Irvine) and Mike Wood (Harwood Institute).

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting convened at 3:00 p.m. with introductions around the room. Susan Walsh, senior planner with the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement (PBCE) Department, provided an overview of the agenda. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) technical memoranda regarding hydrology, flood control, storm drainage, potable water and recycled water. A show of hands indicated that about six of the TAC meeting attendees were also present at the February 7, 2005 Task Force meeting.

2. Update on CVSP

Susan indicated that the recent TAC, Task Force and EIR early consultation meetings are in preparation for the third City Council progress report on April 5, 2005. The EIR Notice of Preparation would be circulated in April 2005. Circulation of the draft EIR (DEIR) is expected in September 2005. Upcoming discussions would be about refinement of the Land Use Plan Concept, design guidelines, zoning, phasing, implementation and financing strategies for the CVSP. Susan encouraged the TAC members to attend Task Force meeting on April 11, 2005.

3. Overview of the CVSP Technical Memoranda Regarding Hydrology and Flood Control, and Storm Drainage

Jim Thompson, with HMM Engineers, provided an overview of the hydrology and flood control, and storm drainage technical memoranda. He explained that the intent of the technical memoranda is to establish a framework for hydrological infrastructure. Sal Yakubu, Principal Planner with the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, indicated that the documents would be included in the EIR as technical appendices. The technical memoranda outline the infrastructure objectives, components, cost estimates, design criteria, and technical, regulatory and environmental issues and considerations.

Jim described the existing and planned conditions of the proposed flood control facilities, such as the central lake, Fisher Creek, detention ponds and the urban canal. He also explained the existing and planned conditions of storm drainage systems, including bioswales, biofiltration and the piping system. Jim stated that 1,100 acres of the total 3,700 acres in North and Central Coyote is currently in the floodplain. Although federal regulation specifies a maximum of “one-foot net effect” for flood control, Jim indicated that the goal is to create “no net effect.”

The TAC provided the following comments:

- How were the hydrological features chosen? How did this become the optimal solution?
Jim explained that two other alternatives were analyzed including a chain of lakes and a

central green. The chain of lake alternative required more land to perform the same function as a central lake and would have been operationally more complex. The central green alternative would not meet the City's C.3 permit requirements for water quality and Hydrograph Modification Management Plan (HMP). The central green alternative would also provide limited floodplain management.

- *Why is the lake located where it is? Jim explained that the lake is there, due in part, to the point where Fisher Creek and the by-pass channel converge. Bailey Avenue acts as an equalization area. Since Coyote Valley is bounded by geographical constraints, there are limited areas where the lake can be located. Other alternative concepts were reviewed, but this location was the best given all of the considerations.*
- *Have mitigation measures been determined for the lake? Jim stated that the EIR would analyze the need for wetland mitigation.*
- *Indication that mitigation is still listed for the lake in the technical memorandum. Susan indicated that reference to mitigation would be deleted from the technical memoranda.*
- *Has the liner of the lake been designed yet? Jim responded in the negative. There is not a final design of the lake yet.*
- *What is the depth of the lake? Jim said that the depth of the lake is about 30 feet. The lake needs to be about 25 feet deep in order to enhance water quality.*
- *What is the maximum depth of the urban canal? Jim indicated that the maximum depth is 2-4 feet.*
- *Concerned with sediment drop in Fisher Creek during low flows. Jim stated that the system is being designed to maintain the flows and minimize sedimentation impacts.*
- *How would silt deposits be controlled in Fisher Creek? Jim indicated that there would be a narrower pilot channel to carry the silt through Fisher Creek during low flows.*
- *Could the areas on either side of the existing Fisher Creek be designed to retain vegetation with a side channel for flows? The EIR would analyze an avoidance alternative that retains the existing Fisher Creek.*
- *Indication that low flow conditions in Fisher Creek would increase vegetative growth.*
- *Concerned that Fisher Creek is too wide and would lead to dry land when there is minimum water flow. Recommended creating a bypass stream.*
- *Need to establish weir designs. Jim indicated that he would look at adding additional weir sections.*
- *How was the 600 acre-feet of required storm water detention determined? Jim said that the additional flood storage needs were calculated from the expected amount of new development and resulting new impervious surfacing. Based on the current requirement to match the existing hydrograph, there is a need for 600 acre-feet of increased flood storage.*
- *Is the stormwater east of Monterey Road included in the figures? Jim responded in the affirmative. It would be necessary to develop an Amended Corrected Storm Water Model showing what is actually occurring on the east side of Monterey Road.*
- *Would Monterey Road be used for flood conveyance? Jim replied in the affirmative. There would be an effort to try to keep water levels at less than one foot to maintain*

- accessibility for emergency vehicles to the area. Jim indicated that there would not be any net effect.*
- What is the hydrological plan for south of Palm Avenue? *Jim explained that with no change in land use, there would not be any net gain from storm water. He is looking at the groundwater recharge ponds in the Greenbelt for increased supply to the system.*

4. Overview of the CVSP Technical Memoranda Regarding Potable Water and Recycled Water

Tracy Hemmeter, with the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD), provided an update of the Water Board's action on the Draft Water Supply Availability Analysis (WSAA). She indicated that the findings in the analysis were consistent with the findings in the CVSP technical memoranda. The Water Board is still considering what the appropriate level of treatment is for the recycled water. They have also questioned the costs for CVSP water supply and how that would be incorporated into the WSAA. The Water Board asked that a statement be added to the WSAA indicating that the water supply developed for the CVSP would not affect the future supply for others in the basin. The Water Board also asked for additional information about the CVSP.

The TAC provided the following comments:

- Would office buildings be required to dual plumb for recycled wastewater? Indication that if the city is expanding North First Street and downtown, then the entire system would need to be upgraded. Recommended looking at the greater use of recycled water in Coyote Valley for the next 30-50 years. *Jim answered in the affirmative, but indicated that office buildings have system limitations. He would look at maximizing the use of recycled water in the Coyote Valley.*
- Can recycled water be used for agricultural purposes? *Jim stated that he has not looked at this issue yet. However, the quality of the water is adequate for full body contact. It would be cleaner than drinking water after treatment.*
- Can recycled water be used in the Greenbelt for organic farming? Due to the shallow ground water table in this area, staff is not certain about the appropriateness of using recycled water for irrigation, and should fully explore this issue with the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD).
- How was the demand for potable water calculated? *Jim indicated that the calculation was based on 25,000 residential units at 100 gallons per person per day, or 300 gallons per unit per day for a total of 7.5 million gallons per day.*
- Where is the additional water coming from? *Jim said that this issue would receive further analysis over the next few weeks. It would also be discussed in the EIR.*
- Is there a specific design for the percolation ponds in the Greenbelt? *Jim indicated that the issue has been discussed by the SCVWD, but no specific details been developed yet.*

- Is the City pumping water into Laguna Seca? *Jim replied in the negative and said that the pump station was terminated.*
- Why has the Great Oaks Water Company not been mentioned? *Jim explained that the technical memoranda are neutral on water retailers, adding that such issues would be discussed in the EIR.*
- Would like a copy of the information HMM Engineers used in determining the future assessment needs for the City of Morgan Hill. *Jim stated that he would provide that.*

5. Open Forum/Other Issues

Susan asked the TAC members to submit any additional written comments on the technical memoranda by March 25, 2005. She indicated that all the comments received from the TAC meeting would be forwarded to the Task Force.

6. Adjourn

Susan announced that the next TAC meeting would be on April 19, 2005.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.